

**REMARKS**

This is responsive to the Final Office Action issued on July 21, 2006. By this Response, claims 1 and 11 are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 1-2, 4-6 and 10-13 are now active for examination.

The Office Action rejected claims 1, 2 and 4-6 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b), as being anticipated by Tognazzini (U.S. Patent No. 5,860,023). Claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tognazzini in view of Zilliacus (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0211856). Claims 11-13 stood rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kameda (U.S. Patent No. 5,828,372).

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections are overcome in view of the amendments and/or remarks presented herein.

**The Anticipation Rejection of Claims 1, 2 and 4-6 Is Overcome**

Claims 1, 2 and 4-6 were rejected as being anticipated by Tognazzini. The anticipation rejection is respectfully traversed because Tognazzini cannot support a *prima facie* case of anticipation.

Claim 1, as amended, describes a presentation system having a display device and a computer unit configured to communicate with a plurality of mobile terminal devices in a wireless manner. Each of the mobile terminal devices includes a pointing device. A control unit incorporated in the computer unit provides input information from the mobile terminal devices on the display device. The control unit includes cursor control means together with a computer program for controlling cursor position information based on the received input information in order to indicate a display on a screen of said display device, using the pointing device

included in one of the mobile terminal devices. Appropriate support of the amendment can be found in, for instance, Fig. 1, page 8, line 25 through page 10, line 22 of the written description, and original claim 3 as filed. Therefore, an exemplary presentation system of claim 1 allows a remote mobile terminal device own by an audience to use a pointing device included in the mobile terminal device to control a cursor on a presentation display controlled by a lecturer.

In maintaining the rejection of claim 1, the Office Action alleged that pointing devices 906, 918 shown in Fig. 9A of Tognazzini appear to meet the claimed limitation. However, it is respectfully submitted that pointing devices 906, 918 of Tognazzini are not part of a remote mobile device. Tognazzini specifically describes that “[t]he central computer also has [two] consoles attached. The first console (900) is for the computer operator and includes a display (904), keyboard (902), pointing device (906) and earphones (903). The second console (916) is for the speaker and includes...a display (920) and a pointing device (918).” See col. 8, lines 21-27 of Tognazzini. Since the consoles are attached to the central computer, the consoles are not mobile devices. Therefore, pointing devices 906, 918, which are part of consoles 900, 916, do not control a cursor from a remote mobile device, as alleged by the Office Action.

Since Tognazzini as alleged by the Office Action fails to disclose every limitation of claim 1, Tognazzini cannot support a *prima facie* case of anticipation. The anticipation rejection is untenable and should be withdrawn. Favorable reconsideration of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 4-6, directly or indirectly, depend on claim 1 and incorporate every limitation thereof. Therefore, claims 2 and 4-6 also are patentable over Tognazzini by virtue of their dependencies of claim 1. Favorable reconsideration of claims 2 and 4-6 is respectfully requested.

**The Obviousness Rejection of Claim 10 Is Overcome**

Claim 10 depends on claim 1 and was rejected as being unpatentable over Tognazzini in view of Zilliacus. The obviousness rejection is respectfully traversed because Togazzini and Zilliacus cannot support a prima facie case of obviousness.

As discussed earlier, Tognazzini fails to disclose every limitation of claim 1. The other document, Zilliacus, was cited by the Office Action for its purported use of a mobile phone as a mobile terminal device. Thus, Tognazzini and Zilliacus, if combined as alleged by the Examiner, still fail to teach every limitation of claim 1. Thus, claim 10, by incorporating every feature of claim 1, is patentable over the combination of Tognazzini and Zilliacus. Favorable reconsideration of claim 10 is respectfully requested.

**The Obviousness Rejection of Claims 11-13 are Overcome**

Claim 11 describes a presentation system including a display and a presentation computer, coupled to the display, configured to communicate with each of a plurality of mobile device in a wireless manner. The plurality of mobile devices includes a lecturer mobile device and at least one audience mobile device. The presentation computer, responsive to a control signal received from the lecturer mobile device, displays cursor identification unique to the lecturer mobile device on the display. The control signal received from the lecturer mobile device is generated by operating a pointing device located on the lecturer mobile device, which controls the position of the cursor identification unique to the lecturer mobile device displayed on the display. Moreover, the presentation computer, responsive to a control signal received from the audience mobile device, displays cursor identification unique to one of the audience mobile devices on the display. The control signal received from the audience mobile device is

generated by operating a pointing device located on the audience mobile device, which controls the position of the cursor identification unique to the audience mobile device displayed on the display.

The Office Action alleged that Kameda discloses every limitation of claim 11. However, upon detailed review of Kameda, it is respectfully submitted that Kameda does not teach a presentation system that provides cursors unique to lecturer mobile device and audience mobile devices on the display. Moreover, the terminal control devices in Kameda are not mobile devices as described in claim 11. Therefore, claim 11 is patentable over Kameda.

Claims 12 and 13 depend on claim 11. Therefore, claims 12 and 13 are patentable over Kameda by virtue of their dependencies.

It is believed that the features described in claims 11-13 are not available in the documents of record, either alone or combined. Favorable consideration of claims 11-13 is respectfully requested.

### **Conclusions**

For the reasons given above, Applicants believe that this application is in condition for allowance, and request that the Examiner give the application favorable reconsideration and permit it to issue as a patent. If the Examiner believes that the application can be put in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representatives listed below.

Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

  
Wei-Chen Nicholas Chen  
Registration No. 56,665

Please recognize our Customer No. 20277  
as our correspondence address.

600 13<sup>th</sup> Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005-3096  
Phone: 202.756.8000 WC:pab  
Facsimile: 202.756.8087  
**Date: December 21, 2006**  
WDC99 1290687-1.062807.0130